



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/534,309	03/23/2000	Yoshinori Ohta	4-165US-FF	9768

21254 7590 08/28/2003  
MCGINN & GIBB, PLLC  
8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD  
SUITE 200  
VIENNA, VA 22182-3817

EXAMINER	
CAMPBELL, JOSHUA D	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

2178  
DATE MAILED: 08/28/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/534,309	OHTA ET AL. <i>S</i>	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Joshua D Campbell	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 March 2000.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 23 March 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)      4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)      5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_      6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application filed on 03/23/2000 and Priority papers filed on 03/23/2000.
2. Claims 1-6 are pending in this case. Claims 1 and 6 are independent claims.

### *Specification*

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the phrase "comparatively simple manner" compares the merits or the invention to that of prior art. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and **should not compare the invention with the prior art.**

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanderpool et al. (US Patent Number 5,781,773, issued on July 14, 1998).**

5. **Regarding independent claims 1 and 6**, Vanderpool et al. discloses a system that displays searched items in a database (column 3, lines 21-24 of Vanderpool et al.). Vanderpool et al. discloses two tables contained within a database, one of these tables contains the full data items and user inputs including terms of search for the data items, while the other table contains parts of the full data items that are to be displayed (Figure 5 and column 6, lines 34-44 of Vanderpool et al.). This database is accessed by using a computer implemented searching system which shows the results on a display apparatus (column 3, lines 21-24 of Vanderpool et al.). This system has the ability to access the databases and thus can be thought of as a read-out device for all elements and tables contained within the database.

Vanderpool et al. does not disclose a system in which the relational database uses three tables for the search and display system. However, the table driven database disclosed by Vanderpool et al. has the same functionality as the applicants'

invention. There is no functional difference between one table that contains two delineated data types and two tables that contain only one type each. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used three tables in the database for the display system of Vanderpool et al. because the table disclosed by Vanderpool et al. which contains the full data items and the user inputs acts as a double-table.

**Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanderpool et al. (US Patent Number 5,781,773, issued on July 14, 1998) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Rowe et al. (US Patent Number 6,466,941, filed on April 21, 1998).**

6. **Regarding dependent claims 2 and 4**, both of the claims 2 and 4 of the applicant's disclosure entail nothing more than the ability to edit data in a table in a relational database. Vanderpool et al. does not disclose the ability to edit items in the data tables of the database. However, Rowe et al. discloses a method of editing items in tables of a database. Editing abilities include adding, deleting, and modifying items contained within the tables of a relational database. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have used the method of Rowe et al. applied into the system of Vanderpool et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because it would have allowed the user to interact with the database in a way that is common practice in the art.

7. **Regarding dependent claims 3 and 5**, both claims 3 and 5 of the applicant's disclosure entail nothing more than the ability to add data to a table in a relational database. Vanderpool et al. does not disclose the ability to add items in the data tables of the database. However, Rowe et al. discloses a method of editing items in tables of a database. Editing abilities include adding, deleting, and modifying items contained within the tables of a relational database. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have used the method of Rowe et al. applied into the system of Vanderpool et al. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because it would have allowed the user to interact with the database in a way that is common practice in the art.

### ***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

**US Patent Number 5,412,774, issued on May 2, 1995, by Agrawal et al.**

**US Patent Number 5,432,942, issued on July 11, 1995, by Trainer.**

**US Patent Number 6,038,566, filed on December 2, 1997, by Tsai.**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joshua D Campbell whose telephone number is (703)305-5764. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 AM - 4:30 PM).

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on (703)308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

jdc  
August 18, 2003



SANJIV SHAH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER